[5th March 1948

Suspension of the Municipal Commissioner, Dindigul.

* 32 Q.—SRI H. M. JAGANNATHAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Municipal Commissioner, Dindigul, was placed under suspension; if so, what are the charges on which he was suspended; how long he was under suspension; what is the result of the inquiry into the charges; and when were orders on the inquiry issued;

(*b*) whether any appeal was preferred by the Commissioner; if so, what are the orders passed on the appeal; when was effect given to them; who is responsible for the delay; and what is the amount paid to the Commissioner while under suspension;

(*c*) whether any extra amount was paid for the period he was under suspension as a result of the order on the appeal of the Commissioner;

(*d*) from what source was the extra expenditure met; and

(*e*) who is responsible for the extra expenditure and what steps have been taken to recover the amount from that person?

THE HON. SRI K. CHANDRAMOULI :—" (*a*) & (*b*) Sri R. Purushotham Sastri, lately Commissioner, Dindigul Municipality, was placed under suspension pending enquiry by the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards with effect from 15th May 1947 (afternoon) till orders were passed by Government on charges framed against him by the Inspector. The following charges were framed against the Commissioner :—

Charge I.—That he grossly abused his powers as Special Officer by passing two resolutions regarding (i) the appointment of a standing counsel and fixation of his retainer fee, and (ii) permitting the contractor to levy and collect fees for sale of cattle in the weekly market.

Charge II.—That he neglected his duty as seen from the following omissions and commissions—

(*a*) omitting to take security deposit in full from Parasuraman, bill-collector;

(*b*) omitting to restrict collection work to those who had furnished security;

(*c*) omitting to do his outdoor and office work properly; and

(*d*) sanctioning cycle allowance to P. Krishnamurti Ayyar, Market Superintendent, when he was not entitled to it.

Charge III.—That he acted in a manner subversive of discipline—

(*a*) by deliberately defying Government Orders regarding acceptance of resignation from subordinates while disciplinary proceedings were pending;

(b) by conniving at indiscipline or by culpably neglecting to take proper action to enforce discipline and maintain the prestige of the office, as evidenced by—

(i) his conduct in merely 'pacifying' subordinates who conducted themselves disgracefully in his presence when strong action was called for in the interest of discipline;

(ii) his ineffective remarks in the running note file of a clerk's personal register;

(iii) his action in merely warning the Superviser under the Municipal Engineer, who had been reported for bad work five times by the Municipal Engineer; and

(iv) his dealing with the clerk under the Municipal Health Officer very leniently when the clerk was persistent in his defaults.

A petition requesting cancellation of the proceedings of the Inspector placing the Commissioner under suspension was received by Government from him, but the Government declined to interfere at that stage and rejected the petition. Government issued orders on 21st October 1947 viewing with extreme disfavour the irregularties committed by the Commissioner warning him severely and directing his reappointment. He was reappointed as Commissioner of the Tirunelveli Municipality on 6th January 1948. There was some unavoidable delay in reposting him as Commissioner, as there was no suitable vacancy in which he could be posted immediately. It was ordered that the period of his absence from the date of his suspension pending enquiry to the date of his rejoining duty should be treated as such leave as he was eligible for and he was permitted to draw the leave salary admissible to him under the rules.

"(c) No extra expenditure was involved in his case.

"(d) & (e) Does not arise in view of answer to clause (c)."

Retrenchment of workers in the King Institute, Guindy.

*33 Q.—SRI P. R. K. SARMA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state whether the Director of the King Institute, Guindy, has submitted any proposals for retrenchment of workers and if the answer be in the affirmative what those proposals and the necessity for them are?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—"The answer is in the negative."

SRI P. R. K. SARMA:—"May I know whether the Hon. Minister is aware that the Superintendent of the King Institute has actually informed several workers, that they have no work for them and that they would be retrenched and that representations have been made on this subject to the Hon. Minister?"

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—"I have no information, Sir, as to what the Director of the King Institute has done.